



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,612	11/30/2001	Sammy Haddad	20.2787	1146

7590 05/03/2004

SCHLUMBERGER TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
ATTN: IP COUNSEL
200 GILLINGHAM LANE
SUGAR LAND, TX 77478

EXAMINER

JAGAN, MIRELLYS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2859

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/006,612	HADDAD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mirellys Jagan	2859	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mirellys Jagan.

(3) Steve Christian.

(2) Jennie Salazar.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 April 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: Curtis and Stewart.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**CHRISTOPHER W. FULTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants explained the teachings of the Curtis and Stewart references, and how they do not disclose the claimed limitations of claims 1 and 17. Applicants stated that neither the Curtis reference nor the Stewart reference teach the claimed limitation (in claims 1 and 17) of using a 3-D fluid flow model for calculating the formation fluid temperature because the model of Curtis is a 2-D model, and the 3-D model of Stewart is a 3-D heat flow model. Therefore, the combination of Curtis and Stewart do not disclose the claimed limitation of using a 3-D fluid flow model. Furthermore, Applicant stated that, because Curtis and Stewart do not teach the claimed 3-D model, several of the remaining limitations of claims 1 and 17 are also not met because they are based on the use of the 3-D fluid flow model. Applicants will file a response to the last Office action presenting the arguments discussed in the interview for further consideration by the Examiner..